

**REMARKS**

In the Office Action<sup>1</sup>, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-14, 16-26, and 28-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,802,467 to Salazar et al. ("*Salazar*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,061,435 to Grundvig et al. ("*Grundvig*") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,243,022 to Furukawa ("*Furukawa*"). The Examiner further rejected claims 2, 15, and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Salazar* in view of *Grundvig* and *Furukawa* as applied to claim 1, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,470,189 to Hill et al. ("*Hill*").

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1, 3-14, 16-26, and 28-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Independent claim 1, for example, recites a telephone set including a connection means to execute a connecting process for enabling transmission and reception of an information signal by radio communication to and from a "first home appliance which supports audio transmission or reception by radio communication with a second home appliance." None of *Salazar*, *Grundvig*, or *Furukawa* teaches or suggests at least the claimed connection means.

*Salazar* discloses "a wireless and wired communications, command, control and sensing system 1 including a handset device 10 and a base station 25 for two way communication of sound, voice, and data to perform telephone communications, remote command and control of appliances and/or apparatuses, remote monitoring, intercom and paging operations, and security functions utilizing both radio and infra-red frequencies" (*Salazar*, col. 6 lines 31-38). However, even assuming the handset and

---

<sup>1</sup> The Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

base station disclosed in *Salazar* correspond to the claimed telephone set, and the appliances and/or apparatuses in *Salazar* correspond to the claimed first or second home appliances, *Salazar* does not disclose both a first and second home appliance that use radio communication for “audio transmission or reception.” Therefore, *Salazar* does not teach or suggest the claimed “first home appliance which supports audio transmission or reception by radio communication with a second home appliance.”

*Grundvig* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Salazar*. *Grundvig* discloses “a cordless telephone handset that uses the same user input unit (e.g., keypad 107) for both user control of a cordless telephone system and for user control of a television.” However, even assuming the television system in *Grundvig* corresponds to the claimed first appliance, it cannot also correspond to the claimed second home appliance. Therefore, *Grundvig* does not disclose the claimed “first home appliance which supports audio transmission or reception by radio communication with a second home appliance.”

*Furukawa* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Salazar* and *Grundvig*. *Furukawa* discloses a “remote control device [that] transmits encoded command messages to [a] vehicle communication module to command the performance of certain functions, such as locking/unlocking vehicle doors and opening/closing vehicle windows” (*Furukawa* col. 3, lines 27-31). First, the vehicle in *Furukawa* is not a home appliance. Second, even assuming the vehicle in *Furukawa* corresponds to a home appliance, it cannot also correspond to the claimed second home appliance. Therefore, *Furukawa* does not disclose the claimed “first home appliance which supports audio transmission or reception by radio communication with a second home appliance.”

Because the cited references fail to teach or suggest each and every element of the claims, no *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established with respect to these claims. Applicants therefore request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 3-14, 16-26, and 28-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 2, 15, and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claim 2 depends from claim 1. As discussed above, none of *Salazar*, *Grundvig*, or *Furukawa* discloses a “first home appliance which supports audio transmission or reception by radio communication with a second home appliance” as recited by claim 1. *Hill* fails to cure this deficiency.

*Hill* discloses using “Bluetooth” as a communication protocol to reduce server workloads. However, *Hill* does not disclose that Bluetooth is used for audio transmission or reception to the server, and the server is not a home appliance. Therefore, *Hill* fails to teach or suggest the claimed “first home appliance which supports audio transmission or reception by radio communication with a second home appliance” as recited by claim 1.

Although of different scope, claims 15 and 27 recite features similar to those of claim 2. As already discussed, none of the cited references teaches or suggests a first home appliance which supports audio transmission or reception by radio communication with a second home appliance.

Because the cited references fail to teach or suggest each and every element of the claims, no *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established with respect to

these claims. Applicants therefore request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 2, 15, and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: July 6, 2006

By: /David W. Hill/  
David W. Hill  
Reg. No. 28,220